



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,835	11/13/2003	Ramajcyam Gopalraj	LOT920030016US1	9518

23550 7590 01/31/2007  
HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC  
75 STATE STREET  
14TH FLOOR  
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
----------

KUMAR, ANIL N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2109

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/31/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/712,835	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GOPALRAJ, RAMAJEYAM	
	<b>Examiner</b> Anil N. Kumar	<b>Art Unit</b> 2112	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/13/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/13/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the original filing of November 13th, 2003. Claims (1-20) are pending and have been considered below.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Tock et al. (US 7146403 B2) in view of Gelsinger et al. (US 5892511).

Claim 1: Tock et al. discloses a system for authentication (col 8 lines 23-25 and Fig. 3), which comprises methods to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page, but doesn't disclose how to identify or locate a specific window type or display the response in a specific window type like an ancestor window. However, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (col 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (col 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2112

art at the time of the invention to provide the feature for locating and displaying information in a specific window, like ancestor window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a specific mode of display, like modal or ancestor windows, depending on the applications need, such as a requirement to get feed back before proceeding to next page, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

Claim 2: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 1 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for the user to send requests through an active window (col 4 lines 23-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to anticipate user requests from any windows, like active windows, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to anticipate requests from any type of window, as the server may have no control on the requests that it receives, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

Claim 3: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 1 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for manipulating windows like closing an active window (col 5 lines 23-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide this feature, like closing an active window,

in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide various window manipulation features that are demanded by web-based applications, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

Claims 4: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 1 above. Official Notice is taken that it is well known within the computer arts since the late 1990's to use modal windows for special purposes, such as "Login", in the internet-based web applications. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide this feature, like using a modal active window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a specific mode of display, like modal windows, depending on the applications need such as a requirement to get feed back before proceeding to next page.

Claims 5: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 1 above. Official Notice is taken that it is well known within the computer arts since the late 1990's to use any window including ancestor window as a top-level window in windows-based applications. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide this feature, making sure that a top-level

window is an ancestor window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a top-level window as an ancestor window, depending on the applications need such as a requirement that a Login page must be a top-level ancestor window, for security reasons.

Claims 6 and 12: Tock et al. discloses a system for authentication (col 8 lines 23-25 and Fig. 3), which comprises methods to process web requests, validate authentication request, authenticate if necessary and return appropriate page or an error page, but doesn't disclose how to identify a specific window type or display the response in a specific window type like top-level window. However, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window selection (col 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (col 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature for locating and displaying information in a specific window, like top-level window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a specific mode of display, like modal or top-level windows, depending on the applications need such as a requirement to get feed back before proceeding to next page, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

Claim 7: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like

ancestor window, as in claim 6 above. Furthermore, Tock et al disclose methods for receiving information (login) and authenticating that information (Fig. 3).

Claim 8: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 7 above. Furthermore, Tock et al disclose methods for fulfilling requests if authentication were successful (Fig. 3).

Claim 9: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 6 above. Furthermore, Tock et al disclose methods for determining if the request has been timed out before fulfilling the requests (Fig. 3).

Claim 10: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 6 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (col 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (col 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature for locating and displaying in a specific window, like ancestor

Art Unit: 2112

or top-level window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide methods for locating and displaying in a specific mode of display, like ancestor or top-level windows, depending on the applications need such as a requirement to get feed back on a specific page before proceeding to next page, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

Claim 11: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 6 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (col 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (col 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to provide the feature for locating, closing or opening a window and displaying in a specific window, like ancestor or top-level window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a basic window features like locating, opening or closing windows in addition to specific mode of display, like display in ancestor or top-level windows, depending on the applications need, such as a requirement to display in a specific window and close the window from which the request came from, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.



Claim 13: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 12 above. Furthermore, Tock et al. disclose a system that returns a valid page to user (Fig. 3). Also, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (col 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (col 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to provide the feature for locating and displaying in specific windows, like hierarchal windows, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a specific mode of display, like hierarchal windows, depending on the applications need such as a requirement to get feed back on a specific page before proceeding to next page, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

Claim 14: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 13 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (col 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (col 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature for displaying the in new window, like top-level window, in

Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a specific mode of display, like a new top-level window, depending on the applications need, such as a requirement that the user need to keep the initial page open, when trying to access a secure page, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

Claim 15: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 13 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (col 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (col 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature for displaying the ancestor window of a current (child) window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a specific mode of display, like an ancestor window, depending on the applications need such as a requirement that the user need to be in the ancestor window, when trying to access a secure page, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

Claim 16: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 12 above. Furthermore, Tock et al disclose

methods for receiving information (login) and authenticating that information (Fig. 3).

Claim 17: Tock et al. discloses a system for authentication (col 8 lines 23-25 and Fig. 3), which comprises methods to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page, but doesn't disclose how to identify or locate a specific window type or display the response in a specific window type like top-level window. However, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (col 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (col 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature for locating and displaying in a specific window, like top-level window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a specific mode of display, like modal or top-level windows, depending on the applications need, such as a requirement to get feed back before proceeding to next page, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

Claim 18: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 17 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window identification, like the type of active window (col 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature for determining a specific window, like child window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide specific features for window identifications, like type of active window, depending on the applications need such as a requirement for not allowing some operations in a parent window, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

Claim 19: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 18 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window identification, like the type of active window (col 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature for determining a specific window, like ancestor window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide specific features for window identifications, like type of active window, depending on the applications need such as a requirement for not allowing some operations in a child window, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

Claim 20: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 18 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (col 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window

selection agent (col 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature for locating, closing or opening a window and displaying in a specific window, like ancestor or top-level window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a basic window<sup>pw</sup> features like locating, opening or closing windows in addition to specific mode of display, like display in ancestor or top-level windows, depending on the applications need, such as a requirement to display in a specific window and close the window from which the request came from, as disclosed in Gelsinger et al.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made for record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  - a. Hahn et al. (US 6,725,446 B1) discloses an information distribution method and system
  - b. Howard et al. (US 6,768,994 B1) discloses a web based data mining and location data reporting system
  - c. Pasquali et al. (US 6,434,563 B1) discloses a WWW browser configured to provide windowed content manifestation environment
  - d. Patterson et al. (US 7,093,005 B2) discloses a graphical editor for defining and creating a computer system

- e. Southgate (US 5,561,757) discloses a computer user interface having tiled and overlapped window areas

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anil N. Kumar whose telephone number is (571) 270-1693. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri EST (Alternate Fridays off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Myhre can be reached on (571) 272-6722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANK

1/18/2007

  
James Myhre  
Supervisory Primary Examiner